

---

## **FDEP COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT 2010 SFER – VOLUME I, CHAPTER 4**

---

Florida Department of Environmental Protection<sup>1</sup>

*October 12, 2009*

### **Chapter 4:**

Table 4-1: Six sub watersheds identified within the table show observed measurements above the baseline average. Are the observed measurements above the max for the baseline POR? If so, should there be a discussion as to why these areas are above the baseline average/max? On the flip side, is there discussion as to why the other basins are performing better than the baseline average?

Table 4-2: Is instrumentation proposed at the Boynton basin to capture discharges.

Line 511: There is a discussion of two primary components. FDEP has many components associated with its NPDES program. This should have some sort of context included within it.

Line 523 to 525: This should be revised to state that water bodies that do not meet the associated criteria may be identified as impaired for particular pollutants, should those pollutants not be considered naturally occurring at levels other than the criteria in the water body (i.e., site specific criteria may apply).

Line 570-571: Should be revised to read “The FDEP was scheduled to submit the final numeric nutrient criteria rule package to the USEPA for review and approval by December 2009. However, FDEP has recently suspended formal rulemaking procedures.”

Line 778-779: Please elaborate on the suspected reasons for the differences in the Indian Prairie sub-watershed.

Line 1845-1846: Is there any idea why?

Line 1864-1867: Is there an anticipated date of completion?

---

<sup>1</sup> Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration, Restoration Planning and Permitting Program, Tallahassee, FL